

Imperial/TP/93-94/14
hep-th/9402062
December, 1993
To appear in the JMO

Some Remarks on Quantum Coherence^{*}

Andreas Albrecht

Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College
Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BZ U.K.
albrecht@ic.ac.uk

Abstract

There are many striking phenomena which are attributed to “quantum coherence”. It is natural to wonder if there are new quantum coherence effects waiting to be discovered which could lead to interesting results and perhaps even practical applications. A useful starting point for such discussions is a definition of “quantum coherence”. In this article I give a definition of quantum coherence and use a number of illustrations to explore the implications of this definition. I point to topics of current interest in the fields of cosmology and quantum computation where questions of quantum coherence arise, and I emphasize the impact that interactions with the environment can have on quantum coherence.

1 Introduction

In a double slit experiment, the striking pattern which appears on the photographic plate is different from anything one could expect from classical

^{*} To appear in the *Journal of Modern Optics* special issue on quantum communication.

“particle”. This is but one of many striking phenomena associated with “quantum coherence”. It is very interesting to consider the possibility that some startling new quantum coherence effects are waiting to be discovered. I am familiar with two diverse fields where this issue has come up, in early universe cosmology and quantum computation.

In cosmology, Grishchuk and collaborators have pointed out that a period of cosmic inflation will naturally land the universe in a coherent superposition of classical states[1, 2, 3]. It would be very interesting if there were astrophysically observable effects of this quantum coherence. My collaborators and I have argued, contrary to claims in the literature, that no calculations so far have revealed quantum coherence effects, and that it is unlikely that such effects could be observed[4]. Still, it would be extremely interesting if our pessimism proved to be wrong.

In the field of quantum computation, one asks whether anything interesting, or perhaps even useful, can be gained by allowing computers to evolve as coherent superpositions of computational states[5, 6, 7]. The issues in computation theory are fascinating and recent progress has generated a great deal of excitement. As a practical matter, any attempt to engineer such a computer would run up against many of the same issues we are confronting in cosmology.

A useful starting point for any of these discussions is a definition of quantum coherence, and that is the first topic of this article. The word “coherence” has been used in a number of different contexts. It is worth noting that here I am not specifically concerned with the notion of the “coherence of a field” as developed, for example, by Glauber [8]. Although not completely unrelated, the notion of “quantum coherence” used here will be a different one (which I define precisely in Section 2).

Regular readers of JMO may find sections 1-4 elementary. These experts might, however, be interested in the way these familiar issues arise in cosmology and quantum computation. This article is also directed at the diverse community of scientists who have developed an interest in quantum computers. The introductory material should be useful to some of these readers.

This is not an article about the foundations of quantum mechanics. The points discussed here may be equally well viewed from a Copenhagen or Everett viewpoint (and no doubt from other viewpoints as well). The points made in this article could probably be re-expressed quite elegantly in the “consistent histories” formalism, but aside from briefly mentioning this pos-

sibility in Section 6 I do not pursue this avenue here.

Section 2 defines quantum coherence, and explores the implications of this definition. The double slit experiment and the WKB states are taken as illustrations, and I also make some general remarks about the *subjectivity* of quantum coherence. The WKB case is peculiar in that on one hand it is the most classical type of state. On the other hand the crucial role played by the complex phase in relating the quantum Hilbert space to the classical phase space allows one to take the unusual view that all of classical physics is a “quantum coherence effect”.

Section 3 examines the important role played by interactions with the “environment”. Such interactions are ignored in section 2, and the discussion in Section 3 shows how dramatically the picture can change when they are included. Section 4 relates the previous discussion to current issues in “quantum computation”, and section 5 describes the way in which questions of quantum coherence have recently turned up in my own field of early universe cosmology. Section 6 briefly points out possible links between the content of this paper and the “consistent histories” formalism. Section 7 contains the conclusions.

2 Quantum coherence in isolated systems

2.1 Definition of quantum coherence

Classical mechanics invites one to view a physical system as point in the “phase space” of possible states. In practice one is ignorant about many details of the physical state of the system. The space of microscopic states is typically enormous, and instead of considering a single point in phase space, one assigns probabilities to a range of possible physical states. Based on the dynamics of the system, one can evolve an initial probability distribution into a “final” one, representing what we know about the system at some later time.

Quantum mechanics is different from classical mechanics in several ways. Firstly, the state of a system is defined most fundamentally by probability *amplitudes* (the “wavefunction”) which must be squared to get the probabilities. Secondly, the space of possible quantum states is quite different from its classical counterpart. Positions and momenta can not be both specified

precisely, the spectra of bound states tend to be discrete, etc. .

This article is concerned with the extent to which quantum systems *can* be treated using probabilities instead of probability amplitudes. To the extent that the probabilities are all one needs, I will say one is working with a “classical” probability distribution, regardless of whether the actual space of possible states has quantum mechanical features or not.

To the extent that one needs to know the initial probability *amplitudes* (rather than just the probabilities) in order to do the right calculation, I will say that the system exhibits “quantum coherence”.

The difference between systems which can be described with classical probabilities and those which exhibit quantum coherence is a practical one. Any physicist should be aware of this distinction, since the type of calculation one undertakes can be very different in the two cases. It is possible that not everyone would agree that this distinction corresponds to *their* notion of quantum coherence, but I am not interested in arguing this point. The distinction I choose to make here is an important one in any case. I suspect most readers who study the illustrations below will find this definition coincides with their notion of quantum coherence.

2.2 Choice of basis

A state $|\psi\rangle$ for a quantum system can be expanded in any orthonormal basis. One gets something of the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i |i\rangle. \quad (1)$$

The complex numbers α_i are the probability *amplitudes* for the system to be found in state $|i\rangle$, and the positive real numbers

$$p_i \equiv \alpha_i^* \alpha_i \quad (2)$$

are the probabilities. If one never used anything but the p_i ’s, the discussion would be indistinguishable from a discussion of a *classical* probability distribution.

The interesting thing about quantum mechanics is that one can discuss the state $|\psi\rangle$ in *any* basis. Denoting a different orthonormal basis with primes:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha'_i |i\rangle' \quad (3)$$

with

$$\alpha'_i = \sum_j \alpha_j \langle i|j\rangle \quad (4)$$

giving

$$p'_i = \sum_{j,k} \alpha_j^* \alpha_k \langle k|i\rangle \langle i|j\rangle'. \quad (5)$$

Clearly one needs to know the α_i 's, not just the p_i 's, in order to determine the p'_i 's. Using the definition from Section 2.1, it would appear that calculations which requires a change of basis involves quantum coherence.

2.3 Time evolution

When the evolution of $|\psi\rangle$ over a particular time interval is given by the unitary operator T , Eqn 1 becomes

$$T|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i T|i\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Now $p_i = |\alpha_i|^2$ gives the probability for the system to be found in the state $T|i\rangle$. If this is what one wants to know, one does not need to use the complex phases of the α_i 's, and one is working with classical probabilities. If one is going to measure the system in some other basis, one will need the complex phases of the α_i 's to determine the probabilities assigned to the new basis states. The p_i 's alone will not provide enough information and one will encounter quantum coherence.

2.4 An Illustration: WKB states

Consider the wavefunction $\psi(x)$ for a single particle.

The wavefunction can be written

$$\psi(x) = \rho(x) e^{iS(x)}. \quad (7)$$

If $S(x)$ varies much more rapidly with x than $\rho(x)$ the state is a WKB state for which

$$\hat{p}|\psi\rangle \simeq (\hbar\partial_x S(x))|\psi\rangle. \quad (8)$$

To the extent that this “WKB condition” holds the state assigns momentum and position simultaneously according to

$$p(x) = \hbar\partial_x S(x). \quad (9)$$

Using this expression one can construct from $\psi(x)$ a probability distribution $P(x, p)$ in *classical* phase space, in which both p and x are specified:

$$P(x, p) \equiv \psi^*(x)\psi(x)\delta(p - p(x)). \quad (10)$$

It can be shown that to the extent that the WKB condition continues to hold, this probability distribution evolves according to the equations for a distribution of classical particles [9]. Thus the time evolution of $P(x, p)$ can be determined simply by solving these classical equations, given the initial $P(x, p)$. The initial probability distribution is all one needs to determine the probability distribution at later times.

Does a WKB system exhibit quantum coherence? On one hand the evolution can be described entirely in terms of classical probabilities (not probability *amplitudes*). On the other hand, Eqs 9 and 10 clearly show that any prediction depends quite explicitly on the complex phase S of the wavefunction (*not* just the probability $\rho^2(x)$). The subtlety lies in the fact that the probability distribution $P(x, p)$ which behaves nice and classically is not simply a set of quantum probabilities $\rho^2(x)$. The evolution of $P(x, p)$ depends very much on the complex phase S of the wavefunction, but this dependence can be re-expressed (using Eq 9) in terms of a classical quantity (the momentum). Thus one is dealing with classical probabilities *and* complex phases at the same time.

Using a strict interpretation of the definition of quantum coherence given in section 2.1, one would have to say that a WKB system exhibits a high degree of quantum coherence. One is clearly making use of the complex phase S , not just the probability $\rho^2(x)$ ¹. None the less, one can think of the

¹ When one studies the Wigner function the quantum coherence of WKB states manifests itself in an interesting way: The Wigner function for WKB states does *not* simply give the appropriate classical probability distribution. The Wigner function is in fact negative in some places, signaling the importance of quantum coherence effects [10, 11, 12]

system purely in terms of the classical probabilities $P(x, p)$. For this reason it might be more in the *spirit* of the definition to say that a WKB system does not exhibit quantum coherence.

Despite the ways in which WKB states are classical there is another sense in which WKB states can be very quantum mechanical. Quantum mechanics can best represent a classical particle with a wave packet which is reasonably well localized in both p and x . For WKB states $P(x, p)$ need not be at all localized in x and p . A delocalized WKB state is a coherent superposition of many classical wave packets. At the end of the section 2.5 I will discuss an example of highly delocalized WKB states: “squeezed states”.

2.5 An Illustration: The double slit experiment

Consider the state $|\psi(t_1)\rangle$ (or wavefunction $\psi(x, t_1) \equiv \langle x|\psi(t_1)\rangle$) of an electron just as it is passing through a barrier with double slits. The quantity $P(x, t_1) \equiv \psi^*(x, t_1)\psi(x, t_1)$ gives the probability density for finding the electron at point x . The wavefunction $\psi(x)$ is the continuum equivalent to the $\alpha'_i s$, with position eigenstates $|x\rangle$ (or delta functions) as the basis. Consider the unitary operator T which evolves the wavefunction to a time t_2 when the electron is well past the barrier. The probability to find the electron at position x

$$P(x, t_2) \equiv |\langle x|T|\psi(t_1)\rangle|^2 \quad (11)$$

will reflect the special double slit diffraction pattern, which is commonly viewed as a quantum coherence effect. (For electrons with momenta comparable to $\hbar/a$, where a is the slit width, this is certainly *not* a WKB system.)

It is interesting to note that *if* one were to choose to measure the electron at time t_2 in the basis given by $T|x\rangle$ (for each x) the probabilities would be:

$$P(Tx, t_2) = |\langle x|T^\dagger T|\psi(t_1)\rangle|^2 = P(x, t_1). \quad (12)$$

The complex phases of the initial wavefunction would be irrelevant, and there would be no quantum coherence effects. Furthermore, having determined which state $T|x\rangle$ the electron is in at time t_2 , one would know exactly where the electron had been at t_1 (but *only* at t_1 !). Our famous inability to determine which slit the electron passed through is an “artifact” of our insistence on measuring the electron *position* at late times, rather than measuring in

the $T|x\rangle$ basis². As a practical matter the $T|x\rangle$ states are highly spread out and differ from each other in highly non-local ways. The prospect of building a device for measuring these states is certainly remote if not completely out of the question.

In contrast, for WKB states our tendency to measure classical positions or momenta allows us to ignore questions of quantum coherence. Probabilities can be assigned to the outcome of such measurements using only the *probabilities* at an earlier time. (Strictly speaking the complex phase is used, but interpreted in a very classical way.) However, one need not always make classical measurements of WKB states. In the laboratory, electromagnetic radiation can be put into “squeezed states” which are classical in the WKB sense. To the extent that photodetectors measure something other than the classical field variables (number eigenstates of the field modes for example) one can in principle observe some dramatic quantum coherence effects[13]. (That is, effects for which the impact of the complex phase S can *not* be simply expressed in terms of a classical momentum.) Ref [14] discusses some practical limitations on such experiments which limit the observability of these effects. SQUIDS are another example of places where quantum coherence effects may be observed for large WKB states (see for example [15]).

If the theory of cosmic inflation is correct, Grishchuk has pointed out that all the matter in the universe was once in a squeezed state. It appears to be unlikely that in this case that the effects of quantum coherence (other than those corresponding to the classical WKB probability distribution) can be observed (see Section 5).

2.6 The subjectivity of quantum coherence

We have seen how the presence of quantum coherence is related to what way one chooses to measure a system. In principle a suitable basis may always be chosen so that no quantum coherence is observed, but in practice this choice may turn out not to be realistic.

I now point out that quantum coherence, as defined in this paper, also depends on how one specifies the initial state. After all, it is always possible

² Knowing the location at t_1 does not actually tell you which slit the electron has *passed through* since it provides no information about the momentum of the electron. To determine this one would best use a “wave packet” type basis at t_1 , which would of course be just as difficult to measure at t_2 as the $T|x\rangle$ basis.

to choose a basis for which the first basis state $|1\rangle$ is exactly equal to the initial state of the system in question. Then using only information about the initial probabilities (namely $p_1 = 1$) one can determine *anything* about the future of the system, no matter in what basis the next measurement will be made.

Thus the discussion of quantum coherence really has to do with what bases we are inclined (or able) to use in describing a system at two different times. The extent to which quantum coherence effects are observed depends on the relationship between these two bases. To the extent that there is sufficient freedom to choose the bases, it will be feasible to describe the system in a way that does not involve quantum coherence.

3 Quantum coherence in non-isolated systems

3.1 Correlated states

The interaction of one quantum system with another can greatly affect questions of quantum coherence [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. These interactions will generically occur, since one is almost always concerned with the behavior of a *subsystem* of the whole universe, and the subsystem must be not completely isolated from the rest for it to be of any interest at all! Thus, instead of Eq 1, one should write:

$$|\psi\rangle_w = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j} |i\rangle_s \otimes |j\rangle_r, \quad (13)$$

Where $|\psi\rangle_w$ is the state of the “world”, and the orthonormal bases $\{|i\rangle_s\}$ and $\{|j\rangle_r\}$ span the “system” and the “rest” respectively.

If it were possible to write the initial state as

$$|\psi\rangle_w = |\psi\rangle_s \otimes |\psi\rangle_r, \quad (14)$$

and if the the system were sufficiently isolated (until it was measured), then it would be reasonable to ignore the “rest” and study only the evolution of the system state $|\psi\rangle_s$. This would correspond to the discussion in Section 2.

In the more general case ($|\psi\rangle_w$ given by Eq 13) it is not even possible to assign a pure state to the system subspace. Instead the system state is described by the density matrix $\rho_s \equiv \text{tr}_r |\psi\rangle_w \langle \psi|$. It is possible, however, to

choose the “Schmidt” basis[25], which brings a general state given by Eq 13 into the following more illuminating form:

$$|\psi\rangle_w = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i^S} |i\rangle_s^S \otimes |i\rangle_r^S. \quad (15)$$

Note that there is only *one* index being summed, and each basis state appears in but one term. The special Schmidt bases for the r and s subspaces are just the eigenstates of the corresponding density matrices ρ_r and ρ_s . The p_i^S 's are the eigenvalues of the density matrices. (Both ρ_r and ρ_s have identical eigenvalues, with the larger one having additional zero eigenvalues.) For completeness, I give a simple introduction to the Schmidt result in Appendix A. This result has seen a large number of fruitful applications in a variety of areas where correlations are important [26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 23, 31, 32, 33, 34].

Given Eq 15 the probability assigned to any system state $|x\rangle_s$ is

$$p_x = \sum_{ij} \sqrt{p_i^S p_j^S} \langle x|i\rangle_s^S \langle j|x\rangle_r^S \langle j|i\rangle_r^S \quad (16)$$

$$= \sum_i p_i^S \left| \langle x|i\rangle_s^S \right|^2. \quad (17)$$

Thus the Schmidt basis is like the special basis discussed in Section 2.6: One need know nothing more than the *probabilities* assigned to the Schmidt states to calculate anything about the system. The Schmidt basis actually coincides with the special basis of Section 2.6 in the limit when Eq 14 holds.

3.2 Time evolution of correlations

In the general case of a system interacting with its environment, one needs to know not just the state of the system, but the state of the environment as well. In general there is nothing predictable about the time evolution of the system state alone. This general case will not concern us here.

A very interesting special case is when the system starts in a pure state (as in Eq 14) and evolves into a mixed state in the following way: An initial state

$$|\psi(t_1)\rangle_w = \left(\sum \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle_s \right) \otimes |\chi\rangle_r \quad (18)$$

evolves into

$$|\psi(t_2)\rangle_w = \sum \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle_s \otimes |i\rangle_r. \quad (19)$$

(In Eqs 18 and 19 ${}_s\langle i|j\rangle_s = {}_r\langle i|j\rangle_r = \delta_{ij}$.) The probabilities assigned to states $|i\rangle_s$ do not change, but the time evolution correlates each state $|i\rangle_s$ with its own orthogonal state $|i\rangle_r$ in the environment. A comparison of Eq 19 with Eq 15 shows that at time t_2 the $|i\rangle_s$'s form the Schmidt basis for the system.

As an illustration, one can think of a pendulum, with the surrounding air as the environment. If one could imagine setting up the pendulum in some huge number eigenstate (corresponding to a macroscopic energy) the pendulum would initially be “spread out” over a macroscopic region. However, the interactions with the air would rapidly correlate the state of the air molecules with the position of the pendulum. Such a process corresponds to the evolution indicated by equations 18 and 19. The timescale for this process (which is related to the time between collisions between the pendulum and air molecules) is many orders of magnitude faster than the oscillation time of a macroscopic pendulum [35].

In order to simplify the following discussion, I will assume the system itself is static, and consider only the effects of the interactions with the environment. Because the “correlation timescale” and the system dynamics timescale are usually so different, this simplification is quite valid over a range of (intermediate) times. Furthermore, the discussion which follows can be easily generalized to include the system dynamics.

3.3 Impact of correlations on coherence

The presence of correlations chooses a special basis for the subsystem (the Schmidt basis). Knowledge of the probabilities p_i^S assigned to these basis states is all one needs in order to calculate *any* amplitudes (as shown in Eq 17).

The correlations can have different implications, depending on the circumstances:

Case I: If initially one is given the the p_i^S 's (probabilities in the basis which *becomes* the Schmidt basis once correlations are established) , and one is later going to measure the system in the Schmidt basis, then one will not be able to tell whether the correlations are present. The results will be the same with or without correlations. In this case one is always working with the p 's and one thus does not observe quantum coherence.

Case II: If one started with the probabilities p'_i 's assigned to some other (primed) basis, the onset of correlations could greatly reduce the value of this information. One would essentially need the p_i^S 's to calculate anything after the correlations were established (which in turn depend on the probability *amplitudes* in the primed basis, not just the p'_i 's).

Case III: If one again starts with the p_i^S 's (probabilities in the basis which *becomes* the Schmidt basis once correlations are established) but *thinks* that the system is isolated, then if one later measures in some other basis, one will *expect* to see quantum coherence effects. One would need to know the initial *amplitudes* to determine.

$$p_x = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_j^* \alpha_i \langle x|i \rangle_s^S \langle j|x \rangle_s \quad (20)$$

$$\neq \sum_i p_i^S \left| \langle x|i \rangle_s^S \right|^2. \quad (21)$$

If the system is actually *not* isolated and gets correlated with the environment (in the form given by Eq 19) then Eq 21 gives the correct answer, and the anticipated effects of quantum coherence are not present. For this reason the setting up of correlations is often called “loss of quantum coherence” or “decoherence”.

3.4 Some remarks on decoherence

If the world is fundamentally quantum mechanical, why did it take us so long to discover quantum coherence? After all, people have studied physical phenomena over most of human history without any need for the notion of quantum coherence. I believe that the primary reason is that there is very good agreement (among observers and environments) as to what basis one uses both to measure and describe the world – namely a basis which closely approximates wave packets fairly localized in x and p . Since nice heavy macroscopic things tend to have WKB evolution, the only quantum coherence effects have a natural interpretation in terms of a classical momentum, as long as one sticks to this “classical” basis (see Section 2.4). Furthermore, since the environment gets correlated with things in the same basis this corresponds to Case I in Section 3.3 and the effects of decoherence are unimportant. For these reasons the effects of quantum coherence are definitely not part of everyday experience, and it takes the efforts of a clever experimentalist to

set up a situation in which such effects are important. (I suppose one could just as well say we *did* discover the complex phase of the wavefunction ages ago, but we interpreted it as the momentum!)

There are various interesting things one could say about this “conspiracy” between us and the environment to use the same measurement basis. On one hand, the action of the environment gives a tremendous evolutionary disadvantage to creatures which might choose to measure in some other basis[22, 24]. The information acquired doing unusual measurements is rapidly rendered useless by the decohering effects of the environment (see Section 3.3 Case II). On the other hand, given the laws of physics which govern creatures and environments alike, nature probably could not have easily made the two interact so differently.

It is worth mentioning here that there are a great variety of physical situations which might be regarded as interactions between a “system” and “environment”. Only a small number of idealized cases have been analyzed carefully (for example [16, 19, 18, 21]). Furthermore, the conditions under which an environment can cause some decoherence without destroying the quantum coherence which is necessary for classical WKB evolution are not always simple ones[36]. A really solid understanding of the extent to which everyday physical processes select a special basis will only emerge after a more systematic effort.

Another view is that even without the environment, our choice of interaction basis and the WKB classicality are enough to account for our classical perspective on the world (see Section 3.3 Case I). Thus decoherence need not be mentioned when discussing why the world looks so classical to us.

In practice, it is usually hard to separate the action of the environment from the act of measurement. For example, when we see something we are counting on the presence of ambient light, which will act as a decohering environment regardless of whether we choose to “bleed off” a few photons for the purpose of measurement.

In any case, an environment which actively defines a special basis through decoherence is present in a wide variety of situations. It is essential that all such decohering effects are properly accounted for when one is looking for quantum coherence effects. In both examples mentioned here (cosmic squeezed states and quantum computers) there are a great many environmental effects which will tend to destroy the quantum coherence. (See [18] for a nice series of illustrations. There it shown that even the microwave

Time step	Computer state			
0	$ 0\rangle_1 \otimes 0\rangle_2$	$ 1\rangle_1 \otimes 0\rangle_2$	$ 1\rangle_1 \otimes 1\rangle_2$	$ 0\rangle_1 \otimes 1\rangle_2$
1	$ 0\rangle_1 \otimes 0\rangle_2$	$ 1\rangle_1 \otimes 1\rangle_2$	$ 1\rangle_1 \otimes 1\rangle_2$	$ 0\rangle_1 \otimes 0\rangle_2$
2... ∞	$ 0\rangle_1 \otimes 0\rangle_2$	$ 1\rangle_1 \otimes 1\rangle_2$	$ 1\rangle_1 \otimes 1\rangle_2$	$ 0\rangle_1 \otimes 0\rangle_2$

Table 1: The time evolution of a simple “copycat” computer viewed in the “computational basis”.

background photons have a strong decohering effect on macroscopic objects. For an application of the ideas of decoherence to quantum optics see, for example, [19].)

4 Quantum computers

4.1 Preliminaries

Let us talk about computers in terms of the space of possible computational states. From this point of view, the physical “computer” consists of every possible bit which is relevant to the computer’s operation, viewed as simple two state quantum system. In this idealization, the states evolve in discrete time steps (from one computational cycle to the next) according to the rules by which the computer is designed to run. (This evolution will not be unitary unless the computer is “reversible”, something real computers essentially never are.)

To illustrate some points it will be useful to consider the following simple-minded “copycat” computer. This computer has two bits of memory, and its rules of operation are simply to copy the contents of register 1 into register 2 and then remain static for all remaining time steps. All possible examples of this computer’s evolution are given by Table 1.

The computer’s evolution defines a preferred “computational” basis

$$\{|0\rangle_1 \otimes |0\rangle_2, |0\rangle_1 \otimes |1\rangle_2, |1\rangle_1 \otimes |0\rangle_2, |1\rangle_1 \otimes |1\rangle_2\} \quad (22)$$

Time step	Computer state	
0	$ +\rangle_1 \otimes +\rangle_2$	$ -\rangle_1 \otimes -\rangle_2$
1... ∞	$\frac{1}{2}(+\rangle_1 +\rangle_2 + -\rangle_1 -\rangle_2)$	0
0	$ -\rangle_1 \otimes +\rangle_2$	$ +\rangle_1 \otimes -\rangle_2$
1... ∞	$\frac{1}{2}(+\rangle_1 +\rangle_2 + -\rangle_1 -\rangle_2)$	0

Table 2: The time evolution of the copycat computer, viewed in another basis (the non unitarity of the evolution is quite apparent).

which I have used above. To illustrate the disadvantages of other bases I use

$$|\pm\rangle \equiv \frac{|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (23)$$

and the defining rules given by Table 1 to arrive at Table 2.

Here are two (related) ways in which the evolution of a computer is simple in the computational basis:

i) If the initial state is exactly one of these basis states (not a superposition), the expansion in the computational basis of the state at later times will always contain only one term. That means that if arbitrary initial conditions are expressed in the computation basis, and one later measures in the computational basis, no quantum coherence effects will be observed.

ii) If the initial state is exactly a computational basis state then the states of all individual “bit” subsystems remains pure throughout the evolution. (This follows from *i)* and the fact that the all computational basis states are simple tensor products of the individual bit states.) When starting with a non-computational basis state (See Table 2), one can say that the other parts of the computer act as an environment which “decoheres” the individual bits.

Having established the importance of the computational basis, one can now discuss the notion of quantum computation. Quantum computation means many things to many people. The question relevant to the discussion here is[5, 6, 7]: Can any advantage be gained by running a computer in a coherent superposition of computational basis states? This subject was pioneered by Feynman, and recent advances by Deutsch have greatly enlivened the field³.

³ Since one can solve the Schrödinger equation on a classical computer there is in prin-

4.2 Remarks on quantum computers

The following remarks illustrate the many links between the field of quantum computation and the discussion in this paper. An expert in quantum computation will find nothing new here.

Point I) Typically, if one were in the end to measure a quantum computer in the computational base there is no point in starting in a coherent superposition. It is just the *probabilities* assigned to the initial computational basis states which will figure into the end result, and there are no quantum coherence effects.

For example, if one starts the copycat computer in the state $2^{-1/2}(|0\rangle_1 \otimes |0\rangle_2 + |1\rangle_1 \otimes |0\rangle_2)$, and later measures it in the computational basis, the results would be indistinguishable from simply using the a classical random number generator to choose initial states $|0\rangle_1 \otimes |0\rangle_2$ or $|1\rangle_1 \otimes |0\rangle_2$ with equal probability⁴. Much of the recent excitement in the field comes from the realization that if one does measure in some basis other than the computational basis one can achieve interesting results.

Point II) Having decided to measure the final computer state in some other basis, one has to be sure to keep the interactions with the environment from destroying the quantum coherence (that is, look out for Case *III* in section 3.3). Unfortunately, the decohering effects of the environment are widespread, and hard to avoid. Fortunately, (unlike the case of squeezed states in the early universe) observing quantum coherence in a computer is in principle an engineering problem which might actually be solved by a sufficiently creative design (see for example [37]).

Point III) The extent to which a quantum computer (or anything else for that matter) loses quantum coherence is at least formally a clearly quantifiable thing: If one has an accurately evolved state for $|\psi\rangle_w$ (in tensor product space “*computer*⊗*rest*”) and one hopes to find the computer in the coherent superposition

$$\alpha_1|1\rangle_c + \alpha_2|2\rangle_c, \tag{24}$$

ciple *nothing* one can calculate on a quantum computer which can not also be calculated on an ordinary computer. The growing interest in quantum computation has to do with the fact that quantum computers can calculate certain things much faster.

⁴Things might not be so simple if two coherent components evolved to the same final state, and the computer varied the phases of the two coherent components differently along the way. (This would not be an issue for a reversible computer.)

then one should simply calculate the off diagonal density matrix element

$$\langle 2|\rho_c|1\rangle \equiv \langle 2|(\mathbf{tr}_r|\psi\rangle_{ww}\langle\psi|)|1\rangle. \quad (25)$$

To the extent that

$$\langle 2|\rho_c|1\rangle = \alpha_1^*\alpha_2 \quad (26)$$

(which corresponds to the pure computer state given by Eq 24) the coherence has been preserved. If correlations with the environment have completely destroyed the coherence one will get

$$\langle 2|\rho_c|1\rangle = 0. \quad (27)$$

It is via these off diagonal matrix elements that information about the phases of the α 's (e.g. $\alpha_1^*\alpha_2$) can enter into the final answer.

Of course the trick is to get ahold of an accurately evolved $|\psi\rangle_w$. The environment is very big, and one might easily forget to include a very weak environment-computer interaction which could still be strong enough to destroy quantum coherence.

5 Squeezed states in cosmology

Squeezed states are examples of WKB wavefunctions which are highly spread out in some direction in classical phase space (but not necessarily in position). Despite the classical properties of WKB states there is thus the possibility of quantum coherence being observed if a basis other than a classical one is used[13, 14].

Grishchuk, and Grishchuk and Sidorov[1, 2, 3] have pointed out that a period of cosmic inflation in the early universe will cause matter to enter a squeezed state. Can this lead to any quantum coherence effects? As I have discussed throughout this article, the answer to this question depends on in what basis one measures the matter, how quickly the coherence is lost due to environmental effects, and whether one wants to call the WKB relation $p(x) = \hbar\partial_x S(x)$ a quantum coherence effect.

It appears that in this case the “environment” and the “measurement” are closely related (much as discussed at the end of section 3.4), and these both measure the classical field variables (such as the gravitational potential). In any case, previous claims that an observable quantum coherence effect had

been calculated have turned out to refer only to effects which have a natural interpretation as classical physics [4].

None the less, it has yet to be argued conclusively that no interesting quantum coherence effects can be observed, and it may be worth considering this question more thoroughly.

6 Consistent histories

The entire discussion in this article is based on a very standard quantum formalism. Namely, the squares of amplitudes give probabilities at a moment in time. If one wants to know probabilities at another time one evolves the amplitudes forward (according to the Schrödinger equation) and squares again.

An alternative formulation of quantum mechanics (pioneered by Griffiths[38] and further developed by Omnes[39, 40, 41, 42] and invented independently by Gell-Mann and Hartle[43, 44, 45]) assigns probabilities to *histories* rather than states at a single moment in time (as long as certain conditions are met).

In other publications[46, 47] I have made the point that the standard formalism seems better adapted for a particular sort of problem. In contrast, I believe the subject matter of this paper can be discussed quite elegantly in the consistent histories formalism. I have stuck to the standard formalism in order to reach a wider audience, and I will only sketch possible links between the two formalisms here.

I have discussed how (in the absence of the wrong kind of decoherence effects) there always is some basis (at later times) to which the initial probabilities are assigned. If one always works in this basis one would never observe the effects of quantum coherence. If one follows this special basis throughout time, then one has a set of “histories”. If one were assigning probabilities to histories, it would seem natural to assign the initial probabilities p_i to these histories. These “constant p_i ” histories probably do coincide with consistent histories, and this suggests that the whole content of this paper could be re-expressed quite nicely in the consistent histories formalism.

7 Conclusions

Quantum coherence occurs when one must use probability amplitudes, rather than just plain probabilities to describe the evolution of a system.

In this paper I have given a number of illustrations of how issues of quantum coherence come up in different circumstances. I have examined the double slit experiment, WKB type systems, quantum computers, and matter in squeezed states (a special case of WKB systems). For WKB systems, the crucial role played by the complex phase in relating the quantum Hilbert space to the classical phase space allows one to take the unusual view that all of classical physics is a “quantum coherence effect”. Special consideration was given to the ability of interactions with the environment to destroy quantum coherence.

I have emphasized how the presence or absence of quantum coherence has to do with what bases one uses to describe the initial conditions, and to measure the system. To the extent that these bases are a matter of choice, the existence of quantum coherence is very subjective.

Realistically, practical limitations on the possible types of measurements combined with the decohering effects of the environment can prevent this subjectivity from being realized. These limitations are the reason why the notion of quantum coherence has only recently been required, despite our long history of observing the physical world. These limitations also provide major (though not always insurmountable) barriers to the discovery of new quantum coherence effects.

8 Acknowledgments

This work is based in part on a talk presented at one of an ongoing series of workshops on Quantum Computation held in Turin and sponsored by the ISI Foundation and ELSAG-Balley. I would like to acknowledge the stimulating environment and generous support provided by the sponsors. I have also benefited a great deal from discussions with Peter Knight on the numerous ways this material overlaps with work in the field of quantum optics.

A The Schmidt Decomposition

A.1 Proof

Here is a brief proof that the Schmidt decomposition may always be performed: Consider a state $|\psi\rangle$ in a vector space which we choose to regard as a tensor product space. Let $\{|i\rangle_1\}$ and $\{|j\rangle_2\}$ each be some orthonormal basis in the corresponding subspace. There always exist α_{ij} 's such that

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij} |i\rangle_1 |j\rangle_2. \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, one can define

$$|\tilde{i}\rangle_2 \equiv \sum_j \alpha_{ij} |j\rangle_2 \quad (29)$$

So that one can always write

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_i |i\rangle_1 |\tilde{i}\rangle_2. \quad (30)$$

In general, the $|\tilde{i}\rangle_2$'s will not be orthogonal or normalized.

Now consider the special case where the $\{|i\rangle_1\}$ are the (normalized) eigenstates of ρ_1 ($\equiv \mathbf{tr}_2(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \sum_{ijk} \alpha_{ij}^* \alpha_{kj} |i\rangle_1 \langle k|$), call them $\{|i\rangle_1^S\}$. In this case the $\{|\tilde{i}\rangle_2\}$ *must* be orthogonal, because we must have

$${}_1^S\langle i|\rho_1|j\rangle_1^S = {}_1^S\langle i|\left(\sum_{k,l} |k\rangle_1^S {}_2^S\langle \tilde{k}|\tilde{l}\rangle_2^S {}_1^S\langle l|\right)|j\rangle_1^S = {}_2^S\langle \tilde{i}|\tilde{j}\rangle_2 \propto \delta_{ij} \quad (31)$$

One can then see that the $|\tilde{i}\rangle_2$'s must be eigenstates of ρ_2 :

$$\rho_2 \equiv \mathbf{tr}_1(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \sum_i |\tilde{i}\rangle_2 {}_2^S\langle \tilde{i}|. \quad (32)$$

Finally, one notes that the non-zero eigenvalues of both ρ_1 and ρ_2 are both given by $p_i = {}_2^S\langle \tilde{i}|\tilde{i}\rangle_2$, and one can construct the normalized states:

$$|i\rangle_2^S \equiv (p_i)^{-1/2} |\tilde{i}\rangle_2. \quad (33)$$

Equation (30) then becomes

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle_1^S |i\rangle_2^S, \quad (34)$$

which is the quoted result.

A.2 Remarks

Here is a remark which often helps people develop some intuition about the Schmidt decomposition: If one is given a particular vector in a vector space, and is allowed complete freedom to choose a basis, one can always choose a basis in which the expansion of the particular vector has but one term. One simply chooses the first basis vector proportional to the state in question. To get a complete basis, one then constructs an orthonormal set around that first basis vector (using the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure). If one does not have *complete* freedom to choose a basis, but is allowed to choose any bases within two pre-determined subspaces, then it should not be surprising that in general one can not get down to a single term in the expansion. However, one should be able reduce the number of terms, since there is some remaining flexibility, and that is what the Schmidt form does. Note that the number of terms in Eq (34) is equal to the *minimum* of the two subspace sizes, rather than the *product* of the two sizes which would arise in a typical expansion.

I should also mention the question of degeneracy. Whenever two p_i 's are degenerate the density matrix eigenstates, and thus the Schmidt decomposition are not uniquely defined. All I wish to do here is assert the view that this fact does not detract from any of the physical points I make in this paper using the Schmidt decomposition. The presence of correlations does not specify a unique basis when the eigenvalues are degenerate, but otherwise the points I make are still valid. In [47] (Appendix A) I give a detailed discussion of degeneracy and the Schmidt decomposition.

References

- [1] L. P. Grishchuk. Quantum mechanics of the primordial cosmological perturbations. 1991. a talk given at the Sixth Marcel Grossmann Meeting, Kyoto.
- [2] L. P. Grishchuk. *Phys. Rev. D*, 45:4717, 1992.
- [3] L. P. Grishchuk and Yu. V. Sidorov. *Phys. Rev. D*, 42, 1990.

- [4] A. Albrecht, P. Ferreira, M. Joyce, and T. Prokopec. Inflation and squeezed quantum states. Imperial/TP/92-93/21, astro-ph@babbbage.sissa.it-9303001, to appear in PRD, 1994.
- [5] R. Feynman. *Opt. News*, 11:11, 1985.
- [6] D. Deutsch. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London A*, 400:97, 1985.
- [7] D. Deutsch. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London A*, 425:73, 1989.
- [8] R. J. Glauber. In C. de Witt, A. Blandin, and C. Cohen-Tannoudji, editors, *Quantum Optics and Electrodynamics (Les Houches 1964)*. Gordon and Breach, 1965.
- [9] P.A.M. Dirac. *Quantum Mechanics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, fourth edition, 1958. Section 31.
- [10] M. Berry. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*, 287:237, 1977.
- [11] A. Anderson. *Phys. Rev. D*, 42:585, 1990.
- [12] S. Habib. *Phys. Rev. D*, 42:2566, 1990.
- [13] W. Schleich and J. A. Wheeler. *Nature*, 326:575, 1987.
- [14] C. Chu and C. Caves. *Phys. Rev. A*, 42:6794, 1990.
- [15] **Pro:** T.P. Spiller, T.D. Clark, R.J. Prance, and A. Widom. Quantum phenomena in circuits at low temperatures. In D.F. Brewer, editor, *Prog. Low Temp. Phys. Vol XIII*. Elsevier, 1992. **Con:** A. Leggett. Les Houches Lectures. In J. Souletie *et al*, editors, *Chance in Matter* North Holland, Amsterdam, 1987
- [16] W.H. Zurek. *Phys. Rev. D*, 26:1862, 1982.
- [17] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett. *Physica*, 121A:587, 1983.
- [18] E. Joos and H.D. Zeh. *Zeit. Phys.*, B59:223, 1985.
- [19] O. F. Walls and G J. Milburn. *Phys. Rev. A*, 31:2403, 1985.
- [20] H. D. Zeh. *Phys. Lett.*, 116A:9, 1986.

- [21] W. Unruh and W. Zurek. *Phys. Rev. D*, 40:1071, 1989.
- [22] W.H. Zurek. *Physics Today*, 44:36, 1991.
- [23] A. Albrecht. *Phys. Rev. D*, 46:5504, 1992.
- [24] J.P. Paz, S. Habib, and W.H. Zurek. *Phys. Rev. D*, 45:1071, 1993.
- [25] E. Schmidt. *Math. Annalen*, 63:433, 1907.
- [26] E. Schrödinger. *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, 31:555, 1935.
- [27] H. D. Zeh. *Found. of Phys.*, 3:109, 1973.
- [28] S. J. D. Phoenix and P. L. Knight. *Phys. Rev. A*, 44:6023, 1991.
- [29] N. Gisin. *Phys. Lett.*, A154:154, 1991.
- [30] S. M. Barnett and S. J. Phoenix. *Phys. Rev. A*, 44:535, 1991.
- [31] S. M. Barnett and S. J. Phoenix. *Phys. Lett.*, A167:233, 1992.
- [32] A. Peres. *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1993.
- [33] H. Huang and J. H. Eberly. *J. Mod. Opt.*, 40:915, 1993.
- [34] A. Albrecht. Locating overlap information in quantum systems. Imperial/TP/93-94/27, hep-th/9404066, *Phys. Rev. D* in press, 1994.
- [35] W.H. Zurek. Reduction of the wave packet: How long does it take? In P. Meystre and M. O. Scully, editors, *Frontiers of nonequilibrium statistical physics*. Plenum, 1986.
- [36] J.P. Paz and W.H. Zurek. Decoherence, chaos, and the second law. Los Alamos Preprint LA-UR-93, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* In press, 1994.
- [37] S. Lloyd. *Science*, 261:1569, 1993.
- [38] R. Griffiths. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 36:219, 1984.
- [39] R. Omnès. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 53:893, 1988.

- [40] R. Omnès. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 53:933, 1988.
- [41] R. Omnès. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 53:957, 1988.
- [42] R. Omnes. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 64:339, 1992.
- [43] M. Gell-Mann and J. B. Hartle. Quantum mechanics in the light of quantum cosmology. In W. H. Zurek, editor, *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information*. Addison Wesley, 1990.
- [44] J.B. Hartle. The quantum mechanics of cosmology. Lectures presented at the Jerusalem winter school on Quantum Cosmology and Baby Universes, 1990.
- [45] M. Gell-Mann and J. Hartle. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on high energy physics*, Singapore, 1991. World Scientific.
- [46] A. Albrecht. Two perspectives on a decohering spin. In J. Halliwell, J. Perez-Mercader, and W. Zurek, editors, *The Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [47] A. Albrecht. *Phys. Rev. D*, 48:3768, 1993.